



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/710,644

07/27/2004

Dimitri J. Stephanou

4643

45525 7590 02/04/2008
DIMITRI J. STEPHANOU
8456 DUNHAM STATION DRIVE
TAMPA, FL 33647

EXAMINER

RAVETTI, DANTE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4194

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/04/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/710,644	Applicant(s) STEPHANOU, DIMITRI J.	
	Examiner DANTE RAVETTI	Art Unit 4194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/27/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

STATUS OF CLAIM(s)

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10710644, filed on 7/27/2004.
2. Claims 1-18 are currently pending and have been examined.
3. Claims 1-18 have been rejected.
4. **Examiner's Note**: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Specification Objections

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 0 (of the Description), line 35, the term, "clients' stomers" is interpreted to mean, by this examiner, to be "clients customers"

Page 0 (of the Description), line 38, the term, "reprovidereside" is interpreted to mean, by this examiner, to be "provider resides"

Page 0 (of the Description), line 40, the term, "client"s" is interpreted to mean, by this examiner, to be "client's"

Claim Objections

6. Claim 1, the word, "soft-ware" should be "software"

Claim 1, the word "comprising" should be inserted at the end of the preamble

Claim 1, the word “parecific” is interpreted to mean “specific” by this examiner

Claim 1, the word “user”s is interpreted to mean “user’s” by this examiner

The appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of **35 U.S.C. §102** that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. **Claims 1 - 11 are rejected** under **35 U.S.C. §102(b)** as being anticipated by Flesner et al., (PGPub 2002/0194267) (U.S. 2002) (“Flesner” hereinafter, which teaches a portal server that provides modifications of user interfaces for access to computer networks).

As to claim 1, Flesner discloses the invention as claimed, a system for generating and running custom-built soft-ware business solutions:

- a. a server further comprising a file of software business solutions (see at least the Abstract; page 1, par. [08]; page 3, par. [037] and [039]);
- b. a network connected to the server for allowing access to the file of software business solutions (see at least page 1, par. [011], [012] and [015]);
- c. at least one user computer connected to the network of the system for selecting and customizing one or more software business solutions (see at least the Abstract; page 1, par. [07], [09], [010]; page 3, par. [035]);
- d. the server further comprising customization instructions adapted to customize the software business solutions to the user’s needs in a series of few steps (see at least page 1, par. [01] (streamlines the process);

- e. the server further comprising a file of customization specific to each user (see at least page 3, par. [036] (associated with sponsor); page 6, par. [101]; page 10, par. [168] and [170]);
- f. the software business solutions further comprising instructions to link users upon login to their own customization files (see at least page 8, par. [135]-[140]);

As to claim 2, wherein the server allows the user of the system to add Information about the organization the user is coming from to include the name and address of the organization in the file of clients (see at least page 1, par. [05]-[06]; page 3, par. [036]; page 6, par. [091]);

As to claim 3, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the client to select a business solution from a list of several business software solutions (see at least page 3, par [036] (navigation buttons or links) - [037]);

As to claim 4, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the client to add information about the looks of the business solution to include the client organization's logo (see at least page 3, par. [036]);

As to claim 5, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the client to customize the screen label name for the data fields of the business solution (see at least page 3, par. [036], [037]; page 4, par. [059], [063]);

As to claim 6, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the client to customize the text fields used by the business solution to generate communication messages (see at least page 7, par. [102]; page 9, par. [157]-[166]);

As to claim 7, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the client to assign an administrator for the business solution by entering information to

include name, userid, password and contact information (see at least page 8, par. [136]);

As to claim 8, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the system to display a summary of customizations that the user has performed at the end of each of the customization steps (see at least page 10, par. [178]-[179]);

As to claim 9, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the user to login as the administrator in order to continue with the additional customization steps (see at least the Abstract; page 4, par. [049]; page 6, par. [102]);

As to claim 10, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to add other users to the file of users and assign login and contact information for those users (see at least page 9, par. [136]);

As to claim 11, wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to assign administrator privileges to one or more users being added to the file of users (see at least page 6, par. [101]-[103]; and page 7, [par. 105]);

Claim Rejection 35 USC §103

9. The following is a quotation of **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in 35 U.S.C. §102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in **Graham v. John Deere Co.**, 383 U.S. 1,148 USPQ 459

(1966) that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the difference between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or non obviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under **35 USC §103(a)**, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under **37 CFR §1.56** to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of **35 U.S.C. §103(c)** and potential **35 U.S.C. §103(e), (f) or (g)** prior art under **35 U.S.C. §193(a)**.

10. **Claims 12, 15 - 18 are rejected** under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** as being unpatentable over Flesner, in view of Budka et al., (PGPub 2003/0131317) (U.S. 2003) ("Budka" hereinafter, which teaches a method and system for organizing non-document specifications).

As to claim 12, Flesner does not expressly disclose the limitation of:

- a server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the system to display a check mark next to each customization step when it is completed

However, Budka discloses this limitation at least on page 3, par. [021]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to modify Flesner to include the features of Budka because check marking is an easy and cost effect method of indication to the user.

As to claim 15, Flesner does not expressly disclose the limitation of:

- server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to add experts to a list to be resident on the file of experts and
- assign information for the experts to include login and contact information, expertise level and attaching a resume for those experts.

However, Budka discloses this limitation at least on page 3, par. [020]; page 1, par. [003]; Fig. 3, 4; page 2, par. [014]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flesner to include the features of Budka because listing experts with their information provides users the necessary tools required to make knowledgeable decision making choices.

As to claim 16, Flesner does not expressly disclose the limitation of:

- server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to assign to the expert appropriate categories of service from the file of categories

However, Budka discloses this limitation at least on page 3, par. [022]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flesner to include the features of Budka because assigning experts to categories assist the user in easy retrieval of the desired information.

As to claim 17, Flesner does not expressly disclose the limitation of:

- server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to assign to the expert sub-categories of service from the file of sub-categories

However, Budka discloses this limitation at least on page 3, par. [022] (...categories within the hierarchy). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flesner to include the features of Budka because assigning experts to sub-categories assist the user in the easy retrieval of the desired information.

As to claim 18, Flesner does not expressly disclose the limitation of:

- wherein the server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to activate any of the experts and change any experts' availability or area of expertise.

However, Budka discloses this limitation at least on page 3, par. [021]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flesner to include the features of Budka because the management of expert's information is critical for keep information current and accurate to the user.

11. **Claims 13 and 14 are rejected** under **35 U.S.C. §103(a)** as being unpatentable over the combination of Flesner and Budka, as applied above, and further in view of Reid et al., (PGPub 2004/0153428) (U.S. 2004) ("Reid" hereinafter, which teaches a communication solution information in a knowledge management system).

As to claim 13, Flesner and Budka does not expressly disclose the limitation of:

- a server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to add service categories to a list to be resident in the file of categories.

However, Reid discloses this limitation at least on page 1, par. [019]; page 2, par. [032]; page 5, par. [061]; Fig. 26; page 5, par. [065]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flesner and Budka to include the features of Reid because providing service categories to the user assists in easy retrieval of the desired information.

As to claim 14, Flesner and Budka does not expressly disclose the limitation of:

- a server further comprises instructions adapted to allow the administrator to add service subcategories to a list to be resident in the file of subcategories

However, Reid discloses this limitation at least on page 4, par. [048] and [056].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Flesner and Budka to include the features of Reid because providing service subcategories to the user assists in easy retrieval of the desired information.

Conclusion

35. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Khandekar, (U.S. Patent No. 7,073,126)(U.S. 2006) teaches a method and system of deploying server-based applications
- Koeppel, (PGPub 2005/0015491)(U.S. 2005) teaches a method, and articles of manufacture for dynamically providing web services
- Anuff, (PGPub 2002/0029296)(U.S. 2002) teaches a portal server that provides a customizable user interface for access to computer networks
- Daniels, (PGPub 2005/01989121)(U.S. 2005) teaches a vertical enterprise system
- Witver, (PGPub 2006/0244768)(U.S. 2006) teaches enhanced personalized portal page
- Poulson, (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,511)(U.S. 2006) teaches a method and system for portal web site generation
- Lauffer. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,165)(U.S. 2001) teaches a method to connect consumer to expert

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from

the examiner should be directed to **Mr. Dante Ravetti** whose telephone number is **(571) 270-3609**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday 7:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mr. Charles Kyle** may be reached at **(571) 272-6746**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **(571) 273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **1-(866) 217-9197**. If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call **1-(800) 786-9199** (IN USA or CANADA) or **1-(571) 272-1000**.

/Dante Ravetti/
Examiner, Art Unit 4194
Thursday, January 31, 2008

/Charles R. Kyle/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4194

